## III. REMARKS

Claims 14, 16,17 and 27-30 are rejected as being obvious over claim 2 of US patent 5,789,711 in view of Arroyo et al based on the ground of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting. Claim 2 of US patent requires that the prongs have a tip-to-crevice ratio of about 2.1 to about 2.8.

Our claim 14 does not require such a ratio and there is no teaching that the elimination of this ratio for the claimed invention wherein there is only one twisted pair conductor from the plurality of twisted pair conductors disposed in each open space is obvious. The present application does not extend the date of the patent in that the patent term is the same as the term of US patent 5,789,711 in that this is a continuation-in part of that patent.

With regard to claims 16 and 17, these claims are dependent on claim 14 and likewise do not require such a ratio and there is no teaching that the elimination of this ratio for the claimed invention wherein there is only one twisted pair conductor from the plurality of twisted pair conductors disposed in each open space is obvious.

With regard to claim 27 and 30, these claims likewise does not require such a ratio and there is no teaching that the elimination of this ratio for the claimed invertion wherein there is only one twisted pair conductor from the plurality of twisted pair conductors disposed in each open space is obvious.

Applicant reiterates that the allowance of claims 14,16-17, and 27-30 does not extend the date of the patent in that the patent term is the same as the term of US patent 5,789,711 in that this is a continuation-in part of that patent.

Therefore it is respectively requested that the rejection of claims 14,16-17, and 27-30 be withdrawn.

Respectfully submitted,

February 13, 2007

Robert F. I. Conte, Registration No. 20,354

Barnes & Thornburg

P.O. Box 2786

Chicago, Illinois 60690-2786

Telephone: (312) 357-1313 Facsimile: (312) 759-5646

CHDS01 JCONTE 920903